

December 17, 1985

THE PLO'S VALUABLE ALLY: THE UNITED NATIONS

INTRODUCTION

Only the threat that Ronald Reagan would boycott the United Nation's 40th anniversary General Assembly session this fall finally persuaded supporters of the Palestine Liberation Organization to drop their demands that PLO chief Yassir Arafat be invited to address the U.N. Yet General Assembly President Jaime de Pinies of Spain made it clear that the PLO is welcome to speak to the General Assembly at any time.¹ Indeed, the history of the past decade reveals that the PLO may be more welcome at the General Assembly podium than is the U.S.

Almost the entire United Nations system, in fact, has become a valuable PLO ally. It has official observer status throughout the system, including the specialized agencies. And just as if it were a member state, the PLO maintains an official mission at 115 East 65th Street in Manhattan and participates in Security Council debates. The U.N. Department of Public Information distributes pro-PLO papers and booklets reaching journalists, academics, and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) throughout the world. Pro-PLO displays and posters grace the lobbies and libraries of U.N. buildings in New York and across the globe. This material is coordinated and sometimes written by the pro-PLO members of the U.N. Secretariat in the Division of Palestinian Rights.

Inside the U.N. Secretariat, the PLO has significant impact on personnel matters and on critical policy decisions. And from its U.N.

1. The New York Times, October 15, 1985.

base of operations, the PLO enjoys access to the American press and espionage opportunities within the U.S.

The U.S. Congress long has chafed at and opposed the PLO's prominence at the U.N. A 1979 U.S. law attempted to cut off American funding for PLO activities. It requires the State Department to withhold the U.S. contribution to the U.N. budget (25 percent) for all U.N. activities that benefit the PLO.² The trouble is that the State Department has been reluctant to enforce this law. It reads its mandate very narrowly and finds every possible loophole to permit continued U.S. funding of U.N.-related PLO activities.³ The State Department does not even conduct vigorous research to determine the extent of such activities. And according to telephone calls to the State Department, in the absence of written documents, the State Department has thus far withheld funding from only three of the many U.N. agencies and committees that support PLO activities.

This lapse of responsibility has come to the attention of Congress. Senator Arlen Specter (R-PA) has asked for a General Accounting Office investigation of PLO activities in the U.N., and Congressman Jack Kemp (R-NY) is looking into how much the State Department has been withholding from the U.N. and why the sum is not higher. Senator Frank Lautenberg (D-NJ) has recently offered an amendment to the Commerce, Justice, and State Department appropriations bill requiring the U.S. to withhold its portion of every U.N. activity that benefits the PLO in any way.

It is not enough, however, to withhold pro-PLO funds from the U.N. budget. The State Department also should enforce the 1947 U.N. Headquarters Agreement, codified in U.S. law as P.L. 357, which allows the U.S., as host to the U.N., to expel the foreign PLO representatives in this country. And the U.S. should look into the possibility of closing down the PLO mission in New York as well as the PLO's Washington bureau, the Palestine Information Office with its two separate D.C. locations.

Today the PLO is a divided, crippled movement. It is kept alive by heavy Soviet subsidies, terrorist activities, and to a great extent, the legitimacy conferred on it by its privileged role at the U.N. This despite its open vow and campaign to destroy Israel, a U.N.

2. Updated as Public Law 98-164, November 22, 1983.

3. See Juliana Geran Pilon, "Blinking at the Law, the State Department Helps the PLO," Heritage Foundation Executive Memorandum No. 20, April 19, 1983. The present counsel to the International Organizations Bureau, Ted Borek, has failed to return phone calls from The Heritage Foundation to question him about his reasons for reportedly advising in favor of a narrow reading of the congressional mandate.

member. For the U.N. to shield and promote the PLO violates the U.N. Charter.

The U.S. should not be an accomplice to this. The President and Congress should instruct the State Department to begin enforcing rigorously the law banning U.S. funding of PLO activities. The President and Congress should call for a thorough U.S. investigation of the PLO role at the U.N. and of its advantageous uses of the U.N. With the findings of such an inquiry, the President and Congress should devise new policies to limit PLO exploitation of the U.N.

THE PLO IN THE U.N.

The U.N.'s endorsement of national liberation movements (NLMs), the blanket under which the PLO claims legitimacy, dates at least as far back as December 20, 1965, when the Soviet-backed General Assembly Resolution 2105(XX) recognized "the legitimacy of the struggle by the peoples under colonial rule to exercise their right of self-determination and independence, and invite(d) all states to provide material and moral assistance to the NLMs in colonial territories." This was followed on December 15, 1970, by Resolution 2708(XXV), an endorsement of using "all the necessary means at their disposal" to achieve their ends. These resolutions provide official encouragement to extremists and terrorists, in particular the PLO, to read the U.N. Charter as legitimizing their use of force. The culmination was the glaring double standard Resolution 3103 of December 13, 1973, which declared that "armed conflicts involving the struggle of peoples against colonial and racist regimes are to be regarded as international armed conflicts" while the use of mercenaries by legitimate governments against NLMs is "considered to be a criminal act." This is in effect an endorsement of the "armed struggle" perpetrated by NLMs--even if it should involve terrorism--while resistance organized against them is condemned as illegitimate.

The cause of the PLO and NLMs in general was further enhanced by the U.N.'s definition of aggression contained in Resolution 3314 of December 14, 1974.⁴ This effectively exculpates terror-violence from any liability when employed on behalf of self-determination movements or against colonial and racist regimes.⁵ The resolution was adopted

4. For an analysis of the negotiations leading to the definition, see Julius Stone, Aggression and World Order: A Critique of U.N. Theories of Aggression (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1976).

5. See Robert A. Friedlander, "Dialogue: The Legal Status of the PLO," Journal of International Law and Policy, Vol. 10, 1981, p. 228.

less than one month after Arafat addressed the General Assembly. There he boasted of the PLO's determination to establish a Palestinian state in the place of Israel,⁶ in line with the Palestinian National Charter Article 19 which states: "the partition of Palestine in 1947 and the establishment of the state of Israel are entirely illegal, regardless of the passage of time."⁷ In his speech, Arafat attacked Zionist "barbarism," Zionist "racism," and its "terrorism." He accused the U.N. of partitioning "what it had no right to divide--an indivisible homeland," the homeland that should be ruled by the PLO.

On November 22, 1974, the PLO was awarded "permanent observer" status at the U.N. by Resolution 3237. Britain's representative emphasized that his government considered the U.N.'s move to be "a fundamental departure from [previous] practice," that brings into question "the nature of the U.N. as it has hitherto been accepted."⁸

Resolution 3236 (XXIX), meanwhile, asked the U.N. Secretary General "to establish contacts with the PLO," and instructed the Secretariat to promote the PLO goals adopted by the General Assembly. It is this resolution to which the Secretariat's Department of Public Information and other agencies point to justify their overtly pro-PLO activities.

The U.N. promotion of the PLO accelerated with the creation of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People (Palestine Committee for short) by Resolution 3376 on November 13, 1975. Though allegedly impartial, the Committee in practice is a platform for pro-PLO statements. Committee Rapporteur Victor J. Gauci, the Permanent Representative of Malta to the U.N., admitted to The Heritage Foundation that the Committee is "fully supportive of the PLO and its goals." The U.N. Secretariat services the Committee through the Division of Palestinian Rights established on December 7, 1977, which produces "reports" and coordinates nongovernmental organization activities sympathetic to the PLO. These activities are enhanced by the U.N. Department of Public Information. On December 7, 1978, General Assembly Resolution 33/28 C requested the Secretary General to "ensure" that the U.N.'s DPI provide "full cooperation with the [Division]."

6. U.N. Document A/PV.2282.

7. The complete text of the Charter is reprinted in J. N. Moore, ed., The Arab-Israeli Conflict: Readings and Documents (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1974).

8. U.N. Document A/PV.2296, pp. 23-25.

Involving the U.N. Secretariat in the promotion of the PLO seriously compromises the ideal of an international civil service. Says Charles William Maynes, Assistant Secretary of State in the Carter Administration: "The U.S. should...be prepared to suspend its membership in bodies where the membership succeeds in diverting the institutional mechanism to favor one cause over the other."⁹

In the past decade, the PLO has reaped increasing support from the U.N. and its specialized agencies through conferences, publications, and a barrage of anti-Israeli General Assembly resolutions. Thomas Franck, Director of the Center for International Studies at New York University School of Law, notes that this violates the U.N. Charter. He writes: "The Assembly thus gave its imprimatur to a movement that seeks the destruction of a member state."¹⁰

Perhaps the U.N.'s most valuable boost to the PLO occurred December 4, 1975, when the PLO was invited to participate in Security Council debates relating to Israeli attacks directed at Palestinian camps suspected of being terrorist bases. The invitation referred to Rule 37, rather than Rule 39. This was very significant for it conferred upon the PLO the aura of being a legitimate state. The reason: Rule 37 covers U.N. member states, while Rule 39 applies to "other persons." The President of the Security Council, at that time the British Ambassador, warned that this would "constitute an undesirable and unnecessary departure from the established practice of the Security Council."¹¹

On January 12, 1976, the PLO once again was invited to participate in Security Council debates as a member state. Professor Leon Gross of Tufts University explains that these invitations directly violated Article 27 of the U.N. Charter. This Article, writes Gross, is "an essential condition of U.S. and Soviet membership in the U.N. If that condition is eroded, the continued membership of the U.S., at any rate, may well become doubtful."¹²

9. Charles W. Maynes, "U.S. Power and Influence in the U.N. in the 80s," in Toby T. Gati, The U.S., the U.N., and the Management of Global Change (New York: New York University Press, 1983), p. 338.

10. Thomas M. Franck, Nation Against Nation: What Happened to the U.N. Dream and What the U.S. Can Do About It (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), p. 219.

11. U.N. Document S/PV.1859, December 4, 1975.

12. Leon Gross, "Voting in the Security Council and the PLO," American Journal of International Law, Vol. 70, 1976, pp. 470-491.

U.N. BUDGETARY SUPPORT OF THE PLO

U.N. budgetary support of the PLO pervades much of the U.N. system. It involves overall policy making, human rights investigations, conferences, films, and a host of other activities that create a kind of "megaphone" for PLO arguments. Among the most important U.N. activities helping the PLO are:

Palestine Committee: Budget for Biennium 1984-1985: \$78,300.

Currently composed of 23 member states and chaired by Senegalese Ambassador Massamba Sarre, the Palestine Committee publishes reports on "The Question of Palestine," organizes conferences throughout the world, and meets with foreign ministers. The PLO is much more than a permanent observer in the Committee's work; it makes proposals and writes drafts of resolutions, which become General Assembly resolutions on the Middle East. The most active Committee participants are its two Vice Chairmen, Cuba's Oscar Oramas Oliva and Afghanistan's Mohammed Farid Zarif. Committee Rapporteur Victor J. Gauci of Malta told The Heritage Foundation that the Committee considers the PLO the legitimate representative of the Palestinian people no matter what changes may take place within the PLO itself. Gauci revealed that Western Europe is a main target of his Committee's efforts. His reason: "The Europeans will then persuade the U.S. The Americans cannot remain isolated, they will have to give in." Since 1983, the Committee has been concentrating on gathering support for an international conference on the Middle East which would involve the PLO. The U.S. withholds from the U.N. budget the equivalent of 25 percent of the amount spent by the Committee.

The Division for Palestinian Rights: Budget for Biennium 1984-1985: \$2,290,800.

The Palestine Committee's logistical support within the Secretariat is provided by the Division for Palestinian Rights. Its pamphlets on the Middle East all support the PLO. Chief of the Division Yogaraj Yogasundram of Sri Lanka says that his staff merely follows the guidance of the General Assembly resolutions that declare the PLO the legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. As such, says Yogasundram, the Division is mandated to promote PLO aims. The Division publishes a monthly bulletin and widely disseminates Arafat's speeches. The U.S. withholds the equivalent of 25 percent of the amount spent by the Division.

Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories: Budget for Biennium 1984-1985: \$283,300.

The General Assembly established this Special Committee in 1968 through Resolution 2443(XXIII), which already had concluded that

Israel was violating Palestinians' rights. The "investigation," therefore, hardly has been impartial. Arguing that the resolution had been motivated exclusively by political and propaganda considerations, Israel has refused to cooperate with this Committee. The results therefore are based on interviews in neighboring states and newspaper reports--all of limited investigative value.

Yet the U.S. has failed to withhold its funding of the Special Committee.

Permanent Sovereignty Over National Resources in Judea, Samaria, and Gaza: Budget for Biennium 1984-1985: \$83,800.

In 1972, the General Assembly requested the Secretary General to look at "the resources exploited by the Israeli colonies and the Israeli-imposed regulations and policies hampering the economic development of occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories." For this purpose, the U.N. Second Committee recommended that "field experts" be hired to prove the foregone conclusion of the investigation. This now is an annual exercise, which relies heavily on PLO sources of information. Complains Israel Eliashiv, the Israeli representative to the U.N. Fifth Committee, an economic issue thus is turned into a political one. The report, for example, ignores significant developments in agriculture in the Israeli-occupied territories and the relatively high living standard of Arabs there. The resolution calling for this report, 39/442, takes an extremely negative approach toward Israel's activities in the territories prior to examination of the facts.

The U.S. has failed to withhold any funds provided to the consultants involved in the report.

Living Conditions of the Palestinian People: Budget for Biennium 1984-1985: \$70,300.

The most recent Secretary General's Report on this topic, A/40/373 of June 14, 1985, was in response to Resolution 39/169 of 1984 calling for an examination of "the deterioration of the economic and social conditions of the Palestinian people." The report, according to impartial experts, is biased and distorts data and statistics to indict Israel. Serious examination of the statistics reveals, moreover, that conditions of Palestinians in the occupied territories not only have not deteriorated but have improved since Israel took control in 1967. Yet this unbalanced report continues to aid the PLO's campaign at the U.N.

The U.S. has not withheld any of the report's funding.

Department of Public Information ("Question of Palestine"-related activities): Budget for Biennium 1984-1985: \$513,900.

The DPI has conducted many programs and media-related activities on the question of Palestine through articles, press releases, newsletters, and pamphlets, particularly since 1982. Then in 1983, Resolution 38/58E, and in 1984, Resolution 39/49C instructed the DPI to cooperate and coordinate its activities with the Palestine Committee.

Resolution 38/58E requested the DPI to disseminate all information on the activities of the U.N. relating to Palestine, expand publications and audio-visual coverage of those activities, and publish newsletters and articles on what the resolution called "Israeli violations of the human rights of the Arab inhabitants of the occupied territories, and organize fact-finding missions to the area for journalists."

DPI also was told to disseminate information on the results of the International Conference on the Question of Palestine. DPI published a newsletter on the Conference in Arabic, English, French, and Spanish. A pamphlet containing the Geneva Declaration on Palestine and resolutions subsequently adopted by the General Assembly was issued in all the official U.N. languages. This year, DPI has published a booklet on the work of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices and plans also to publish a booklet entitled "Highlights of U.N. Activities on the Question of Palestine." It also intends to produce a short film on Palestine. DPI radio news broadcasts on the question of Palestine, meanwhile, were expanded in 1984 and 1985.¹³ The U.S. withholds the equivalent of 25 percent spent by the DPI on the "Question of Palestine"-related activities.

U.N. Information Centers: Budget for Biennium 1984-1985: \$24.5 million.

The PLO's message is broadcast throughout the world by the DPI via its U.N. Information Centers in 67 countries. These centers publicize each November 29 as the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People. Under instructions from the General Assembly, DPI gives this day "the highest priority." The DPI's Mahmoud El-Said refuses to disclose the contents of the official reports on the DPI November 29 activities.

In Washington, D.C., the U.N. Information Center disseminates Palestine Committee films. The Palestine Information Office in

13. U.N. Document A/AC. 198/85.

Washington may also use the services of the U.N. Information Center, particularly the films, for its own propaganda purposes.¹⁴ Other probable Washington users of DPI films are the Palestine Congress of North America, established in 1979 to serve as an umbrella group for more than 50 North American-based, pro-PLO organizations, the American Friends Service Committee (well known as pro-PLO), and various pro-PLO campus groups, especially at George Washington University. When Congressman Jack Kemp (R-NY) requested information on the use of DPI films on the Middle East, he was refused.

The U.S. does not withhold any funding of U.N. Information Centers. It is not clear how much of the Centers' funding is spent on "The Question of Palestine" activities, given their secrecy.

The Department for Technical Cooperation for Development:
Budget for Biennium 1984-1985: \$132,600.

This Department of the U.N. Secretariat has hired "consultants and general temporary assistance pertaining to the sovereignty over resources of the occupied Arab territories." This funding is a means of channeling aid to pro-PLO activists. It is mandated by the same resolution as the report regarding the permanent sovereignty over national resources in the occupied territories.¹⁵

The U.S. does not withhold funding for this activity.

Covering up U.N. outlays that help the PLO is so widespread that sketching a complete picture of the U.N.'s PLO activities is virtually impossible. Palestine Division Director Yogasundram admits, for example, that the entire Department of Conference Services provides various kinds of help to PLO conferences and seminars. The cost of sending delegates to Palestine Committee conferences, meanwhile, can be easily disguised as an expense not related to PLO activities. This is clear from the March 26, 1985, Summary Record of the Palestine Committee meeting held on March 21. It states that "because of financial constraints, representatives of the German Democratic Republic, Pakistan, Tunisia, and Yugoslavia, could attend the Asian Seminar (on Palestine) as members of the delegations of other U.N. committees, such as the Council for Namibia, the Special Committee on Decolonization, and the Special Committee Against Apartheid." The

14. The PIO, funded by the PLO to the tune of about \$200,000 per year, circulates PLO propaganda materials to U.S. government officials, has sponsored a weekly radio program, and gives frequent interviews to the media, including NBC's "Today Show," Cable News Network, National Public Radio, and others. It has offices at 818 18th Street, N.W., and 1337 22nd Street, N.W.

15. See U.N. Document A/C.5/38147.

documents state that "their costs should be charged against the budgets of those committees"--and not to any cost center linked to the PLO.¹⁶

In sum, with the exception of the Palestine Committee, the Palestine Division, and the Department of Public Information, the U.S. State Department has failed to withhold funding from U.N. agencies that support PLO-related activities--at least as far as can be determined from telephone communications with the State Department in the absence of written documentation.

THE PLO MISSION AT THE U.N. AND THE PLO PRESENCE IN THE U.N.

While the Department of State has stopped short of declaring the PLO to be a terrorist organization, Robert B. Oakley, Acting Ambassador at Large for Counterterrorism, told The Heritage Foundation that the State Department is "on a de facto 'special look-out'" in the case of any PLO member who applies for a visa to come to the U.S., "because so many PLO members turn out to be terrorists." Given the nature of the PLO, which has never renounced terrorism, the U.S. now should consider ordering that the PLO Mission in New York be closed.

The 1947 Headquarters Agreement between the U.S. and the U.N., codified as U.S. law P.L. 357 in 1947, states that "nothing in the Agreement shall be construed as in any way diminishing, abridging, or weakening the right of the U.S. to safeguard its own security." The roles of the PLO and Yassir Arafat in terrorist activities clearly are a threat to the security of the U.S. and its citizens. The murder of Leon Klinghoffer in the Achille Lauro hijacking confirms this--as do many other incidents.

The inherent foreign affairs power of the President under the Constitution, moreover, allows Ronald Reagan to close not only the PLO's observer mission to the U.N. but also the Palestine Information Offices in Washington. Whether any PLO offices' staffers are American citizens has no bearing on this.¹⁷

16. U.N. Document A/AC.1931/SR.115, p. 4.

17. While the Constitution protects freedom of speech and of assembly, there is no unlimited right to work for, or make contracts with, a foreign entity. The right of the federal government to control commercial dealings with foreign parties was established in 1936 by the Supreme Court. See U.S. vs. Curtis-Wright Corporation, 299 U.S. 304 57 S.Ct. 216 81 L.Ed. (1936).

The 1947 Headquarters Agreement also gives the U.S. the right to regulate the activities of PLO members working for the U.N. Secretariat. It is difficult, however, to determine who in the Secretariat is a member of the PLO. Zehdi Terzi, the PLO's representative, told The Heritage Foundation that "members of the PLO fill the quotas of other Arab nations, such as Jordan." This matter merits further inquiry.

THE U.N. AS A MEGAPHONE FOR THE PLO

Media

The Division for Palestinian Rights in the Secretariat organizes meetings of journalists in cooperation with the DPI. A team of ten prominent journalists and media representatives from around the world visited Tunisia, Egypt, Jordan, and Syria from April 23 to May 11, 1984, to be educated on "The Palestine Question." The regional seminars for journalists on the question of Palestine were organized on June 4-7, 1984, in Vienna, Austria, where seventeen European journalists representing the press, radio, and television media participated. Fourteen journalists from various African nations participated in another seminar held at Arusha, Tanzania, August 28-31, 1984.

On February 5-8, 1985, a conference was held for journalists in the North American-Caribbean region at Bridgetown, Barbados, and another for Asian journalists, in Jakarta, Indonesia, from May 7-10, 1985. Latin American journalists met June 10-13 in Georgetown, Guyana.

At the Georgetown media seminar, for example, Yassir Arafat reiterated the PLO's determination to continue its "struggle and resistance to the hostile policies of Israel and the U.S."¹⁸ At the same seminar, Rashleigh Jackson, Guyana's Minister for Foreign Affairs, stated that the seminar was part of a program of action drawn up by the Palestine Committee, thereby assisting "in the overall coordination of the strategies of the supports of the Palestinian cause all over the world." Israel was invited to participate in these media seminars but refused, not wishing to legitimize them.

The impact of all these activities is difficult to assess but cannot be denied. According to Tommy Koh, Singapore's Ambassador to the U.S. and its former U.N. representative, "If you were in Asia or Africa or Latin America 15 years ago and you asked people about the Palestinians, everyone looked puzzled. Today, students,

18. Division for Palestinian Rights, Vol. VIII, Bulletin No. 6, June 1985.

intellectuals, and political activists in every country know about the Palestinian cause and sympathize with it. That's the result largely of the U.N. People are always underestimating the importance of the U.N. in altering perceptions."¹⁹ Ambassador Koh told The Heritage Foundation that the PLO has virtually won the propaganda game in the U.N., which provides one-sided information on the Middle East.

Ambassador Koh also noted that he was appalled by the way the Western media covered the 1982 war in Lebanon. At a State Department conference on December 10, 1984, dealing particularly with the impact of the 1975 "Zionism is racism" Resolution, Ambassador Koh cited the West German press, which actually equated the Israeli's behavior in the 1982 war with the Nazis. This never would have happened, charged Koh,

...had the ground for such a comparison not been carefully prepared years ago by the United Nations when it equated Zionism with Racism. The corrupt arithmetic of the General Assembly has indeed become the "conventional wisdom" of international society--or at least of that part of international society which likes to think of itself as "enlightened" and "progressive." I believe, therefore, that I am justified in concluding that the impact of the Zionism as racism resolution has been enormous, and that, by serving to legitimize anti-Semitism, it continues to pose a major threat to the survival of Israel and the Jewish people.

Nongovernmental Organizations

The mobilization of U.N.-based nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) is one of the most significant recent successes in the PLO's effort to use the U.N. American NGOs seem particularly gullible. The U.N. and NGO Activities on the Question of Palestine, published by the Division for Palestinian Rights, outlines the spectrum of such activities. At the July 10-12, 1985, meeting of NGOs in New York, for example, PLO representative Terzi urged "consciousness raising" techniques such as polls and surveys to promote American identification with the Palestinian cause as defined by the PLO.

In 1983, the International Conference on Palestine held in Geneva extended invitations only to NGOs that were supportive of the PLO. By excluding some NGOs for political reasons, this conference violated Article 71 of the U.N. Charter.²⁰ In the aftermath of the

19. The New York Times Magazine, September 16, 1984, p. 62.

20. For a detailed analysis of this episode, see Harris O. Schoenberg's forthcoming book, A Mandate for Terror: The U.N. and the PLO (New York: Steimatzki Publishing Company).

conference, there has been accelerated NGO activity throughout the world on behalf of the PLO.

A number of Soviet-linked NGOs play an active role in coordinating pro-PLO activities. Among them are the World Peace Council, the Women's International Democratic Federation, the World Federation of Democratic Youth, the International Organization of Journalists, the International Association of Democratic Lawyers, and the Christian Peace Conference. The Afro-Asian People's Solidarity Organization is particularly active.

CONCLUSION

The U.N. provides the PLO with financial support. More important, the U.N. anoints the PLO with legitimacy. Conferences, seminars, and meetings produce countless papers which are translated in many languages, broadcast, and distributed to opinion makers throughout the world. Palestine Committee members lobby inside the U.N. with foreign ministers and other dignitaries on behalf of the PLO. And nongovernmental organizations affiliated with the U.N. further disseminate the PLO's message. The U.N. Secretariat, through the Department of Public Information and the Palestine Division, produce films and pamphlets promoting the PLO. No matter that this violates the Charter's provision that the Secretariat be impartial--as well as the Charter provision that the integrity of member states (in this case, Israel) should not be compromised by actions of the U.N.

The U.S. at last should take strong measures to stop the U.N. from being exploited by the PLO. Specifically:

- o The State Department should enforce vigorously current law requiring that the U.S. withhold its portion of all U.N. funds that support activities benefiting the PLO. This should include, for example, the expenses of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices, funds for consultants "investigating" the conditions of Palestinians in the territories of the West Bank and Gaza, and other hidden expenses.

- o The U.S. should consider closing the PLO Observer Mission in New York City and the Palestine Information Offices in Washington, D.C.

- o In conformity with Senate Joint Resolution 98 passed on August 15, 1985, which urges the U.S. Representative to the U.N. "to take all appropriate actions necessary to erase" the "Zionism is racism" resolution, the U.S. should seek to rescind the resolution in the General Assembly by requesting another vote to that effect.

o The U.S. Congress should hold hearings to determine the extent of PLO activities in the U.N.

o The State Department should enforce vigorously the amendment to the State Department appropriations bill introduced by Senator Nancy Kassebaum (R-KS) requiring the U.N. to introduce weighted voting on budgetary matters or else reduce the U.S. contribution to the U.N. to 20 percent. This measure also would allow greater U.S. leverage on the U.N. budget.

o The U.S. Congress should require General Accounting Office investigations as a prerequisite of further U.S. funding for the U.N. The U.S. should demand, for example that the DPI disclose information regarding the activities of U.N. Information Centers on issues related to the Middle East.

o The State Department should declare the PLO "a terrorist organization."

Juliana Geran Pilon, Ph.D.
Senior Policy Analyst